

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-14 and 16-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over US patent 7,187,658 to Koyanagi et al. (hereinafter Koyanagi) in view of US patent publication 2002/0046292 by Tennison (hereinafter Tennison).

Applicants thank the Examiner a telephone interview of June 4, 2008. We discussed a proposed amendment. The Examiner suggested changes to the amendment, to which the Applicants agreed. Applicants submit a modified amendment with this response.

### **Amendments to the Claims**

Applicants have amended claim 1 with the limitation "...the first and second network characteristics each comprising a network type indicator, a cost indicator, a security indicator, a bandwidth indicator, a signal strength indicator, a time remaining indicator, a logon period, and a mobility indicator, the mobility indicator comprising a coverage area..." The amendment is well supported by the specification. See original claims 14, 27, page 17, ¶ 17 – page 18, ¶ 60.

Applicants have further amended claim 1 with the limitation "...dynamically connect the electronic computing device to the best network if authorization for the best network is automatic, and request and receive a user authorization from a user, provide the user authorization, and dynamically connect the electronic computing device to the best network with the user authorization if the authorization for the best network is not automatic..." The amendment is well supported by the specification. See page 29, ¶ 95-96.

Claims 16, 17, and 28-30 are similarly amended. Claims 5, 6, 19, and 20 are amended to

conform to the amended claims from which they depend. Claims 14 and 27 are canceled. In claim 3, the phrase “Claim 3” that was deleted in the response of September 24, 2007 but allowed to remain in the response of January 18, 2008 is also removed without edit marks to correct the previous omission.

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-14 and 16-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Koyanagi in view of Tennison. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 1 as amended includes the limitations:

“...a network query module configured to query a first network for a plurality of first network characteristics and to query a second network for a plurality of second network characteristics, the first and second network characteristics each comprising a network type indicator, a cost indicator, a **security indicator**, a bandwidth indicator, a signal strength indicator, a time remaining indicator, a **logon period**, and a **mobility indicator**, the mobility indicator comprising a coverage area;

a service level module configured to determine a first network service level based on the plurality of first network characteristics and to determine a second network service level based on the plurality of second network characteristics;

a best network module configured to determine a best network from the first and second networks based on the first and second service levels; and

a network connection module configured to dynamically connect the electronic computing device to the best network if authorization for the best network is automatic, and **request and receive a user authorization from a user, provide the user authorization, and dynamically connect the electronic computing device to the best network with the user authorization if the authorization for the best network is not automatic...**” Independent claims 16, 17, and 28-30 as amended include similar limitations.

Applicants submit that the combination of Koyanagi and Tennison does not teach the security indicator, logon period, and mobility indicator claimed by the present invention. In addition, Koyanagi and Tennison do not disclose requesting and receiving a user authorization from a user, providing the user authorization, and dynamically connecting the electronic computing device to the best network with the user authorization if the authorization for the best network is not automatic. Applicants therefore submit that claims 1, 16, 17, and 28-30 are allowable. Applicants further submit that claims 2-13 and 18-26 are allowable as depending from allowable claims. Claims 14 and 27 are canceled.

#### Conclusion

As a result of the presented remarks, Applicants assert that the application is in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required regarding the traversal of the rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler  
Reg. No. 38,527  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: June 6, 2008  
8 East Broadway, Suite 600  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111  
Telephone (801) 994-4646  
Fax (801) 531-1929